

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please amend the drawings as follows.

The three attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 5, 6, and 9.

The first sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. In Figure 5, reference character 85 has been deleted.

The second sheet, which includes Fig. 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6. In Figure 6, reference character 85 has been deleted.

The third sheet, which includes Fig. 9, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 9. In Figure 9, reference character 162 has been deleted.

## **REMARKS**

Applicant is in receipt of the Final Office Action mailed March 29, 2006. Claims 1 – 37 and 40 – 45 were pending. Claims 1, 5, 17, 29, 42, and 43 have been amended. Claims 1 – 37 and 40 – 45 remain pending in the application.

Independent claims 1, 17, 29, 42, and 43 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in Applicant's specification at least at page 11, lines 14 – 19 and page 15, line 8 – page 16, line 3.

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The Final Office Action objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)-(p)(5). Applicant herewith resubmits amended drawings to overcome the objection.

### **Objection to the Claims**

The Final Office Action objected to claims 29 and 43 for a lack of clarity in the transitional phrase. Applicant has amended claims 29 and 43 to clarify the transitional phrase and overcome the objection.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 7, 12 – 14, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 37, and 40 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Craig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,111) (hereinafter "Craig"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in light of the following remarks.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites:

1. A portable storage device comprising:  
storage, wherein the storage is configured to store a network identity for a processing unit and configuration information for the processing unit; and  
an access controller;  
wherein the processing unit comprises a device reader configured to read the network identity and the configuration information from the storage, and  
wherein the processing unit is identifiable on a data communications network using the network identity.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Craig fails to teach or suggest a portable storage device comprising storage “configured to store a network identity for a processing unit ... wherein the processing unit is identifiable on a data communications network using the network identity” as recited in claim 1. Craig discloses a network computer which is configured to receive and read an access card. The access card stores user-specific power-management information for the network computer. The access card also stores user identification information which, when validated, allows the user to access the network computer (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 27 – 31). The identity stored in Craig’s access card identifies a particular user, not the processing unit used by the user. Therefore, Craig fails to teach or suggest storage which is configured to store “a network identity for a processing unit.” Craig also fails to teach or suggest that the “processing unit is identifiable on a data communications network using the network identity.”

Applicant reminds the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence of each and every limitation of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Craig fails to disclose the limitations “wherein the storage is configured to store a network identity for a processing unit” and “wherein the processing unit is identifiable on a data communications network using the network identity.” Therefore, Craig cannot be said to anticipate claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art, and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Because independent claims 17, 29, 42, and 43 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1, these claims are also believed to patentably distinguish over Craig. Applicant also asserts that numerous other ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 4, 9, 19, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig and further in view of Dancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,789) (hereinafter “Dancs”). Claims 8, 10, 11, 20, 21, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig and further in view of Rubin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,140) (hereinafter “Rubin”). Claims 15, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig and further in view of Takiyasu et al. (Japan Patent Publication No. 07-058749) (hereinafter “Takiyasu”). Claims 16, 24, 27, 28, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig and further in view of Kamper. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,797). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5681-04202/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,  
Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8840  
Date: June 29, 2006